

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the labeling bore statements, designs, and devices, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein 10% Fat 2% Fibre 15%," which were false and misleading and deceptive to the purchaser.

On March 23, 1925, the Atlantic Milling Co., Augusta, Ga., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled by changing the guaranteed analysis to read "Protein 7½%, Fat 1½%, Fibre 17½%," and that the word "Oats" be stricken from the statement of ingredients and the words "Peanut Hulls" added thereto.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13303. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. v. 99 Boxes of Oranges. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction or sale. (F. & D. Nos. 19853, 19854. I. S. No. 20712-v. S. No. W-1672.)

On February 12, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 99 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Randolph Marketing Co., Bryn Mawr, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from Bryn Mawr, Calif., on or about December 31, 1924, and transported from the State of California into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Mallard Brand Randolph Marketing Co. California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, to wit, decomposed oranges.

On April 23, 1925, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal, said judgment containing the proviso that the product might be sorted under the supervision of this department and the good portion sold.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13304. Misbranding of meat scrap. U. S. v. 200 Sacks of Meat Scrap. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 19465. I. S. No. 21289-v. S. No. E-5089.)

On January 2, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of meat scrap, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Westminster, Md., consigned about November 3, 1924, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Allentown Mfg. Co., from Allentown, Pa., and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Jordan Meat Scrap Guaranteed Analysis Protein 55% * * * Manufactured By Allentown Mfg. Co., Allentown, Pa."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the label bore the statement, regarding the said article, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein 55%," which was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On February 24, 1925, Englar & Sponsellar, Westminster, Md., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it not be sold or disposed of until plainly and conspicuously labeled to show its contents.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13305. Misbranding of butter. U. S. v. Darter Butter Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 18306. I. S. Nos. 4599-v, 4600-v, 4676-v.)

On March 7, 1924, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the